SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1900.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid. PAILY, per Month. DAILY, per Year DAILY AND SUNDAY, DET Year DAILY AND SUNDAY, per Month I estage to foreign countries added. THE SUN, New York City.

Paris-Kiosque No. 12, near Grand Hotel, and Klosque No. 10, Boulevarde des Capucines.

If our triends who favor us with manuscripts for sublication with to see reserved articles returned, they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

A Century of Migration.

The greatest migration that history races during the century now closing. Up to 1820 only about 250,000 foreigners moved to this country, which has many fold surpassed all the rest of America in accessions to its population through immigration; but between 1820 and 1882 more than 17,000,000 Europeans left their homes for the Americas and other parts of the new world.

The Lightide of the European exodus a greater evil: was reached in 1882, when the United which two years this country saw 1,140,000 Europeans enter its ports. Between 1882 varous parts or the world was over 9,000,000 souls. Then followed a decline in the volume of migration, this country arrivals in other regions, notably in Brazil and Argentina, about held their own or increased. In the six years ending with attainable justify the statement that during the century Europe has been drained of about 30,000,000 persons seeking to better their fortunes in other lands.

The world never before saw anything comparable with this tremendous movement of people in so short a space of time. The population that Europe has thus lost in a hundred years is greater than the total number of inhabitants of Great Britain and Ireland in 1860, and only a little less than the number in the United States in the same year. It represents a third more people than Great Britain and Ireland gained in population in the ginning to loom up as serious questions. first ninety years of the century. It is equal to three-fifths of the total population of Europe in the time of Augustus CESAR. ferrying them to their new homes.

No probability can be discerned that any later century will see the equal of this miwith industry and population. There are no more virgin lands to occupy; no more such enticements to draw millions from the homes of their fathers.

The Archbishop and the Ritualists.

Church of England. After submitting for signed by 13.794 lay Archishop of Canterbury by a delegation set for inflicting the death penalty. printed in the Guardian it reads:

"We, the undersigned, being communicants of the Church of England, desire, with all respect to your Grace's high office, to enter our solemn protest against the 'Opinion' which your Grace and the Archbishop of York have recently put forward on the subject of incense and proces ional lights.
"And this we do on the following grounds:

"Firstly, that your Grace has attempted, not merely land, but also to press such definition upon dioceses of which your Grace is not the ruler. And, however ready your Grace's Suffragans may be to submit to this, we, as Catholic lay people, most strennously protest, and will resist to the utmost a precedent which may lead us into a position differing but little from that against which the Church rightly pro-

"Secondly, we protest against your Grace's attempt to foist upon the Church, as her rule of ceremonial. a penal act of Parliament passed in days of regal autocracy, and intended to meet elecumstances entirely different from those of to-day. And we are the more aggrieved, because we were led to suppose that your Grace had intended to investigate the question upon the principles of Catholic law and custom and liturgical science, and not upon the construction of the alleged law of the State."

days of regal autocracy" is the Act of Uniformity of 1559, which, as Archbishop TEMPLE pointed out in his reply, is an integral part of that Book of Common Prayer that all Churchmen are expected to follow, and was fully accepted by the Church in Convocation in 1603 and in 1661. The death. Upon the trial it was proved that he "position against which the Church rightly | bought an ounce of prussic acid at a drug protested 300 years ago" is Archbishop LAUD's attempt to force upon the kingdom the Book of Common Prayer and the Church ceremonials he thought befitting, and his labors "that the external public worship of Gop might be preserved and that with as much decency and uniformity as might be, being still of opinion that unity cannot long continue in the Church where uniformity is shut out at the church door." That High Churchmen in a formal document should assail their martyred Anchbishop and the principles for which he | drop of the acid was ever used for the purdied on the scaffold, and should justify the

Great Robellion and the Scottish Covenanters, is astounding. In his address when presenting the protest, the Duke of Newcastle, though re- asserts that if he had gone upon the witness spectful in manner and as far as he could be stand and testified in his own behalf, as he in language, denounced the Archbishop to desired to do, he could have given a true his face. He told him that he had no and perfectly adequate explanation of why authority to impose his views on the he bought the prussic acid and what he junctive preterit, is equivalent to the modern potencense question and given a wrongful inter- acquittal if corroborated by the testimony pretation to the law, and wound up with of five other witnesses, who he now knows the threat of demanding the disestablish | could give evidence in his favor, although ment of the Church rather than submit to he did not know it then. the law, if Dr. TEMPLE's understanding of

it is correct. He said : that are her own prerogative and that Spirit's by

pose that law on the Church, even though the contrary view might involve a serious conflict with the ecular power.

Other speakers complained of unfair treatment of the Ritualists, and specified many evils in the Church which the Archbishops have left untouched, among them the marriage of divorced persons and the omission of the recital of the Athanasian creed in some churches.

Archbishop TEMPLE had evidently been prepared beforehand. He answered the protestants, not heeding the personal denunciations, with a fatherly discourse on the Book of Common Prayer, the application of the Act of Uniformity and the relative duties of Bishops and their flocks. He denied that the Archbishops were trying to establish an Anglican Pope. He justified them for dealing first with ritualistic abuses:

a right, because of their personal study of the history of the early Church, to go outside the Praver has recorded is that of the European Book are very much more far reaching in their consequences than the claims of those who neglect what is before them. It is a very serious thing if men claim that they may pick up here and there from the history of the early Church practices which approve themselves to their minds, and then insist that without any authority they may make them part of the public worship of the Church of Eng-

With regard to disestablishment he met the delegation's threat with the prospect of

"It has been said this afternoon that the one rem States alone received 800,000 immigrants. | edy is disestablishment. Well. I am afraid that that The two next greatest years in this move- remedy would be found very far indeed from a ment of population were 1888 and 1892, in remedy of the kind which those who call themselves the Catholic party would like when they got it. It is a very serious thing to say that it is necessary to break up the whole position of the Church of Engand 1893 the European outpouring to land in order that you may escape from the control of Bishops who do not in your judgment adopt what you consider to be Catholic practices. The loss to the whole resigious life of the in the volume of migration, this country | Carr h which would necessarty follow from the receiving only a little over 300,000 immi- | disruption of the Church would be greater I think grants in 1894 and 200,000 in 1897, while | than it would be very easy to neasure. But I con fess that it is the one anxiety which besets me in all this matter. I am quite ready to face disestablishment and its necessary concomitant disendowment if it be God's will. I am quite prepared in that 1899 about 3,000,000 Europeans sailed for | case still to go on and act as if we stood in the same for eign lands. The most trustworthy data | position as we have beid for the last three buildred years. But I dread - with all my soul I dread-what might come if the Church of England were to break

their practices and are sure to make trouble the breaking in two of the Church are be-

The New Trial in the Benham Case. For the first time in the history of this If the ships on which these emigrants em- State, a new trial has been granted in a barked carried, on an average, 500 pas- capital case after a judgment of death sengers, 60,000 trips have been made in against the defendant has been affirmed by the Court of Appeals. The final effect may be to save the life of Howard C. Benham, who stands convicted of having murdered gration. The fairest parts of the world his wife by the administration of prussic that were wildernesses in 1800, now teem ; acid, at their home in Batavia, N. Y., in

January, 1897. BENHAM was convicted at a criminal term of the Supreme Court in Genesee county in September, 1897. His case was argued in the Court of Appeals on June 13, 1899, and decided on the 24th of October Trouble has broken out again in the last. The Court of Appeals, speaking through Judge HAIGHT of Buffalo, held some months pretty generally to the ruling that no legal error had been committed of the two Archbishops against the use of upon the trial and that there was sufficient incense and of movable lights, the Ritual- evidence tending to establish the defendchurches the practices censured have been | for the jury. Judge Vann of Syracuse was | resumed and a protest against the conduct | the only member of the court who dissented from this conclusion, but he wrot communicants, has been presented to the senting opinion. A date was thereupon

headed by the Duke of NEWCASTLE. The At this stage of the case it appeared, inprotest is an extraordinary document, not | deed, as though the prisoner's last hope only in its tone, but also in the complete | had gone, so far at least as the courts were change of attitude assumed by the High | concerned. His counsel, however, were not | usage, old and new, straight as a string Church party toward its past history. As discouraged. There was still one resource and long accustomed to the best society in themselves of it.

Section 465 of the Code of Criminal Procedure authorizes the Supreme Court to grant a new trial in a criminal case " where it is made to appear, by affidavit, that upon another trial the defendant can produce evidence such as, if before received, to define by an individual and autocratic exercise of | would probably have changed the verdict; wer the ceremonial practice of the Church in this if such evidence has been discovered since the trial, is not cumulative, and the failure to produce it on the trial was not owing to want of diligence." In a capital case, if the court in which the trial was had is not in session, the application may be made to

any Justice of the Supreme Court. Proceeding under these provisions of law, BENHAM's counsel moved for a new trial before Mr. Justice Hooker, sitting at Buffalo. The Governor granted a reprieve to give the court time enough to consider the case carefully; and on Wednesday Judge HOOKER filed a decision granting the application. It is expected that the new trial will take place in some other county than The "penal act of Parliament passed in Genesee, on account of the difficulty of

securing an impartial jury there. The evidence which is relied upon to exonerate the defendant, when he is tried again, relates chiefly to the purpose for which he purchased prussic acid, and the use which he made of that poison shortly before his wife's wanted it for a stricture and that he did not wish the sale to be registered. The clerk offered to give him a better preparation for that ailment, saying that he had never heard of using prussic acid in such a case; but BENHAM took away both the clerk's

preparation and the bottle of prussic acid. "His excuse for the purchase of this poison," said Judge HAIGHT in the Court of Appeals, "is far from satisfactory, and no evidence has been offered showing that a pose specified by him." The weakness of the defence in this respect was obvious, and must have contributed largely to the conviction of the prisoner. BENHAM now Church, that he had mismanaged the in- | did with it, which would have secured his

When Mrs. BENHAM's body was examined, proofs were found of the presence of prussic "Inasmuch as the secular power, on that hypoth- acid in the brain, the blood and the liver. esis, forbids that which the Church enjoins, the Church must declare herself ready to forfeit such stomach. But how account for its occur- and in the spoken speech. The objection to beneats as she gains from her alliance with the rence in these other parts of the system? it arises from a misapprehension of what The prosecution accounted for it by the the English language is, from an attempt

read before Judge HOOKER.

The story is simple. BENHAM had for some years suffered occasionally from a malady which, at the suggestion of a friend, he had treated with a solution of prussic acid, administered by injection. The treatment afforded relief, and he informed several physicians of his experience in this respect. Mrs. BENHAM, in the autumn of 1896, became a sufferer from the same ailcure in her case as he had in his own, her husband purchased the dilute prussic acid at the village drug store for use by his wife as a wash and for purposes of local injection. Employing the drug in this way, the manifestations of its presence in the body after death were to be expected. In brief, the defence insists that the husband gave his wife the poison not to kill her but to cure her-and, still further, that she was "The claims of those who maintain that they have | not killed by prussic acid at all, but by a diseased condition of the heart heightened

by the excessive use of morphine. Of course, Benham's own testimony in support of these allegations cannot be regarded as newly discovered evidence. If time of his trial all that he knows personally about them now. There are the five other witnesses already mentioned, however, whose evidence Judge Hooker is satisfied has been discovered since the trial, and whose testimony he declares to be in some respects as important as that of the defendant himself. If their corroboration had been at hand at the time of the trial. very likely the prisoner's counsel would have consented that he should go upon the witness stand; and, as it was, BENHAM swears that he did not yield to their advice in this matter until assured that the greatest chemists in the State were present and were prepared to testify that Mrs. BENHAM did not die from the effects of poison.

Under the rules of law which govern applications for new trials on the ground of newly discovered evidence, such a motion would hardly be granted in a civil case where the party himself had remained silent in respect of the principal point, and where the evidence relied upon as newly discovered is merely corroborative of statements which the party might have sworn to Dr. TEMPLE may have seen the humor of | upon the first trial if he had simply chosen the Archbishop of Canterbury's having to do so. Probably Mr. Justice HOOKER to explain the meaning of the Act of Uni- | deemed it his duty to be less stringent in a formity to High Church people, but he took | capital case, where the decision of the Court care not to betray it. The ritualists are of Appeals had not been unanimous, and chafing under the restrictions put upon | where that tribunal in upholding the judgment had nevertheless expressed its regret before long, while the fanatics among the that the autopsy upon the body of the Low Church people are again becoming alleged victim "was not as carefully or active. Disestablishment in England and fully performed as it should have been." This is a matter of some little importance

in a poisoning case. After the conviction of BAT SHEA in the celebrated Troy election murder case, for killing Robert Ross, and after the confirmance of the conviction by the Court of Appeals, an application similar to that in the Benham case was made to Mr. Justice MAYHAM of Schoharte, then a Justice of the Supreme Court in the Third Judicial District. The so-called newly discovered evidence was the statement of a convict that he himself really killed Ross. On the trial this same convict had testified that Ross was shot not by SHEA, but by a man named BOLAND. Judge MAYHAM did not think that a jury would believe the second story of this witness any more than a jury believed his first; and being unable to hold that the proposed evidence would probably result in a different verdict if the case was tried over again, the Judge was compelled to deny the motion. This was in February. 1896. The application in behalf of BENHAM ists are making ready for action. In some ant's guilt to make it a question of fact is the only one of the kind which has been made since then in a capital case, so far as

A Victim of the Parsing Habit.

we now recall.

About once a year we explain, with a weary and hopeless spirit, but for the sake of the truth, that "had rather" is a perfeetly sound and kind phrase, of the best of judicial procedure left, and they availed the English language. About once a week we get a letter like this:

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN-Sir: " Had rether be Governor" (SUN, this morning). Can you parse that? Thousands of grammarians hang on your reply.

NEW YORK, Feb. 8. Well, the sight of thousands of grammarians hanging would be some comfort to us, and to the rest of mankind. "Can you parse that?" Notice the undertone of expectant triumph. We can parse it, but why should we want to parse it, O, victim of thousands of grammarians? Does the Engish language exist for the sake of being parsed" by a gang of grammarians who tch to breech it if it "won't parse"? Is

English literature a vast parsing book? Plenty of persons think so; and when they get hold of a good idiom, and cannot explain it by rule of thumb, they sniff at it. say it "won't parse," call it an error and warn the world away from it. Before his soul was lost to grammarians, did our correspondent never read in the Psalms?-

"I had rather be a doorkeeper in the house of my Gop than to dwell in the tents of wicked

Did he never read in First Corinthians? "Yet in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue."

Probably the makers of the King James version did not dream that "had rather" store in Batavia, telling the clerk that he | would be any more of a stumbling block than "might teach" to the grammarians. SHAKESPEARE makes Hotspur use the forbidden phrase twice in one scene, the first of the third act of the first part of 'King Henry IV.":

"I had rather be a kitten and cry mew, than one of

these same ballad-mongers." And a little further on Hotspur "had rather live With cheese and garlic in a windmill, far, Than feed on cates and have him talk to me In any summer-house in Christendom." We take these extracts from Dr. CRUDEN and the "Shakspeare Phrase Book." Accessible authorities enough, we should suppose; and we must not neglect to call in our little friend, the Standard Dictionary, but for the last time

on this subject: "In certain phrases of preference, as-had rather had better, had as lief, &c., the had, early hadde, subtial would have, mith have; I had rather die I would have death rather; I had liefer die I would have hold it, i. c., to die, liefer, dearer. From Anglo-Saxon to CHAUCER, me were liefer to die, to me it would be dearer to die. was the more common idiom; from 1450 to 1550, I had liefer, from 1550 onward, I and rather. Since Jounson, grammarians

and reformers have urged I would rather." that are her own prerogative and that Spirit's by Whom she acts and Whose vicar on earth she is. We do not say that such a condited is inevitable; but we do not say that, your Grace's view of the law being what the new trial which has been granted is a post, and such account for it on the new trial which has been granted is grammarians imagine that they can make the form of the English language is, from an attempt to discard an expression that has grown up to discard an expression that has gro

it is, we are aggreed that you have sought to im- fully disclosed in the affidavits which were the English language. With just as much reason a census collector might pretend to be the Creator. It is for the grammarian to take the facts of language as they are, and not to try to alter them. Parsing is not the chief duty of man or language.

The Hon. GEORGE SEWALL BOUTWELL has collected his lamentations into a book cailed. "The Crisis of the Republic." The crisis began with the Venezuelan message ment, and thinking that he could effect a continued in the annexation of Hawaii and in the war with Spain, and is now acute in ex pansion ; butit is Mr. BOUTWELL, not the Republic, that suffers from this crisis.

> The Hon. CHARLES K. LADD of Kewanee, a candidate for the Democratic nomination for Governor of Illinois, asserts that he "does not seek office and does not want to." The Democoatic nomination for Governor of Illinois this year is exactly suited to Mr. Lapp's aversion

CHANGE OF PLAN IN SOUTH AFRICA

The withdrawal of Gen. Buller's force on Thursday from the positions it occupied north of the Tugela is being apologized for by the London papers in various tones, but the broad fact that it was impossible to advance in the averments are true, he knew at the face of the Boer artiller; and rifle fire is sufficient explanation. It is now announced that given out with such confidence that it may be accepted as true. To what side then will Gen. Buller turn this next time? As it is not likely that he will again try any of the routes from which he has already had to retreat, his next advance must be further to the west or east of any of the roads he has yet tried. He may renew his attempt at a turning movement against the Boer right, this time by Hongers Poort and Bethany; or he may strike for Ladysmith by the Weenen road. The former seems the more probable and for this reason: if the news from the Orange River and the Modder River indicate anything, it is that the unconnected action of the four Generals is now brought under central control and that Lord Roberts is about to inaugurate a combined movement, which, if successfully and Kimberley. This movement should be a converging one into the Free State from all sides, introducing a large force like a wedge between the Boers in Natal and those on the western border of the Free State, and placing those at Stormberg and Colesberg in imminent danger of being cut off from their line of retreat to the north. A failure to cross the Orange River by either the Colesberg or Sterkstroom columns would not materially interfere with the success of the operation; it would be sufficient for one or other of those columns to pass the river to compel the Boers opposing the other to retire. It would be different should any mishap overtake the extreme western force under Gen. Methuen, and it is against it that the Boers may be expected to develop their greatest efforts, in order to give the corps now at Colesberg and Burghersdorp time to fall back on whatever positions may have been selected in the Orange Free State, when they are no longer abie to make head against Gens. Gatacre and French Equally the Boers in Natal may be expected to oppose a movement by Gen. Puller toward the Drakensberg with the same object.

The forces immediately under Lord Roberts. with which the above indicated movement may be made, were on Jan. 26 seven batteries of artillery and thirteen battalions of infantry all intact, and five Colonial corps, of which four are mounted, at De Aar. Under Gen Methuen, north of the Orange River, there were three reg ments of cavalry, six batteries of artillery and furteen tattalions of infantry, and four Colonial corps, of which three are mounted. There are four Colonial corps and part of a battalion of British regulars in Kimberley, and two Colonial corps and part of two others in Mafeking. Under Gen, French, headquarters at Reasburg, there are four regiments of cavalry, three batteries of artillery, four battalions of infantry, a brigade of mounted infantry and four Colonial corps, two of them mounted. Finally, under Gen. Gatagre at Sterkstroom, there are three batteries of artillery, five battalions of infantry and four Colonial corps, all mounted. The strength of the force under Gen. Kelly-Kenny, last heard of at Thebus, is not known, but cannot be less than a brigade, with artillery and some mounted men. Since Jan. 26 considerable reënforcements have arrived, so that there cannot be less than 15,000 mounted troops and 40,000 infantry, with about 132 guns, in the various columns ready to take the field and hold the communications. Within the Care Colony itself every district has been called on to organize a volunteer corns to maintain order and watch the suspected Dutch

Afrikander population.
The campaign in South Africa is now entering on an entirely new phase, and one which promises better chances of success for the British than the last. At the same time the natural difficulties in the way of an advancing army, having to depend entirely on wagon and mule transport for its supplies on lengthening communications, are enormous. When such Modder Camp to Kooloesberg, only fifteen miles, took the better part of two days, it can easily be imagined what it will be when the distances to be covered stretch into the hundreds, with a vigilant and active enemy offering opposition at every point. It has been asserted on good authority that in the northern part of the Free State and in the Transvaal every natural position where a stand can be made has already been prepared for defence and that the British advance will be disputed step by sten.

Room Enough.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN-Ser: Surely you can find places in your roll of fame for Mr. Wick Ware and Mr. Salim Ghiz, both of New York. S. R. CHURCH.

Consumption.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN-Sire "Is the connmptive condemned to die?" are the final words in a letter in your issue of to-day. Most consumptives ould fill column with their experiences and systems of treatment they have tried with more or less uccess. I have had mine, and my honest opin on is that if the patient has a fairly good constitution he can and will pull through on plenty of beef, mutton, milk and, above all, sunshine. obacco absolutely alone, take just as little n edicine tobacco absolutely alone, take just as little medicin as possible and never, never let a deciver scare by Fifteen months and I was given up by several the tors. Had sax from first to last and they nearly permethed to the same of the s ahead of the germs. And once a head of them keep in good health and they cannot trouble Inger.

If consumptives would learn how to breathe proerly, and put less faith in what the doctor says, anget right up and fight the germs many more would
win. Sushine and good food are the best me
cines, but faith in your ability to come of tri
umphant is a great help.

Milford, Conn. Feb. 8.

Theatre Ticket Prices.

To the Editor of The Sun-Sir: I cannot resist the temptation to send you a line expressing my ap- What is the tacaning of her cortifications at San proval of the remarks by "A Would Be Theatre boer," apropos of prices, speculators, &c., in today's Sun.

While the great Augustin Daly was alive and managing his theatre it did not seem exorbitant to pay \$2 for a seat there. The extra price was made ap to one in the freedom from speculators, the certainty of seeing a fine play and in the all-pervading elegance and tone of the house and the courtesy of

THE SURRENDER OF THE CANAL. The Dangerous Admissions and Concessions of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN-Sir: Your seteral editorials on the Isthmus Canal are most excellent. It took a war sufficiently to impress us with the importance and desirability of the canal in order to prompt us to our present activity toward its construction. Yet, by this treaty, concluded while the recollection of the trip of the Oregon is fresh in our minds, in forfeiting our right to fortify the canal or otherwise secure to ourselves the greatest benefit accruing from the enterprise of which we stand the entire cost, we purpose to abandon the very advantage to secure which we are ready to expend our treasure, viz: The guaranteed safe and prompt passage of our war vessels through the canal particularly in case of war and especially in a war involving our-

In the event of war with England, with our limited Atlantic squadron engaged at some other point, say in the north Atlantic, what is to prevent England, with her numerous navy, from stationing a fleet at the eastern entrance of the canal, in order to possess and mine the same, and completely to frustrate an attempt by us to reenforce our Atlantic fleet by our Pacific equadron? What power would we have to pre

vent it, having no fortifications? Why does England retain Gibraltar? Would she keep it open to a hostile fleet, that by passing that way could endanger her coast? Haven't we here a Gibraltar of our own, as important to us as England's is to her? Are we to relinquish it—give it away just for a fancied concession by Great Britain of her rights by the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, which rights she has forfeited by herown violation of that treaty and therefore has no rights to concede? Then to be generous, in true American fashion we throw in a portion of Alaska. Isn't this all a primary grade of diplomacy?

Our mission is to build the canal, just as we built the Erie Canal, all by ourselves, without restriction or interference from any source. In times of peace, or when our vital interests are not jeopardized, all the world can share this good thing with us, but when we are attacked shall we not be prepared to avail ourselves of all means at our command for our defence being forced to relay their hold on Ladysmith | us and open opportunity for general European intervention in our affairs?

NEW YORK, Feb. 9. R. J. CALDWELL.

A Demand for Delay.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN-Sir: Let me add my voice to the volume of protest that is beginning to go up against the new canal treaty. I do not pretend to condemn it, for I realize there must be much about it which I cannot be in a position to know; but it seems only just that time be given to the people to get the queer-looking thing through their heads and make up their minds about it before t is rushed through the Senate to ratification. It may be all right, but it seems to some of us be all wrong.

I fear that it may prove the long-searchedfor flaw in the Administration policy which will give the Democratic party something to howl about next fall. It seems as if we are being cheated by Englandin a treaty which, pretending to perform the utterly unnecessary work of abrogating the preposterous Clayton-Bulwer Trenty, is more preposterous than the riginal. It seems as though Secretary Hay has out-Claytoned Clayton. This may be al wrong, but all the same I am trying to imagine

James G. Blaine signing such a treaty. I, for one, cannot help thinking that besides ing a commerce canal, this waterway is bound necessarily to be a war canal. Commerce has demanded it ever since Columbus sailed out to find the northwest passage to the Orient. Commerce has done without it all these centuries and would probably have to do without it another century had it not been for the Spanish war and the voyage of the Oregon around the Horn at a moment when the American people were listening and looking. The present movement for the canal, if I have read aright, is a direct response to the demand of the Oregon. The canal is a war canal, and beng a war canal it is just as much a piece of est defence as the mounted guns in the Narws and should therefore be just as much reporty of the Federal Government.

And as a contrivance of coast defence, I ask. will it not subserve as well the interests of s, save to the enemy in time of war?

sesses it would not be able to defend the canal seems to me the first thing we would want to do would be to blow up the canal ourselves. If we cannot defend the canal, by all means let us have no canal or, next best, let us have the right-which this freaty denies-of destroying it in case our fleets are discomfitted. I can't imagine anything worse than to be at the mercy of an enemy in possession of the isthmian canal. We would be putting weapons into the hands of our

The bearing of the treaty upon the Monro Doetrine also raises objections that I think are reaty may be all right. It is the work of very able men. This is what puzzles me. But, if i is all right, so much less reason is there for rushing it through fear of allowing it to be hammered out in the Senate and the press. NEW YORR, Feb. 9. HOWARD M. CANNON.

The Nicaragua Canal and the Political Conditions of This Continent.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN-Sir: Your ediorin's relating to the Hay-Paunce ote treaty are inspiring to every American citizen, native or foreign-born, who values the future well-being of this Republic above a temporary rise or fall in the market price of our corporate securities. To surcender the absolute control of an interoceanie canal of our own construction in the event of a conflict with one of the "world powers" is to voluntarily consent to having our hands tied behind us, or, in other words,

On this continent of North America there is n propressible conflict between the British Great Britain in the Dark Continent.

Secretary Sewarl anticipated the conflict when in 1864 he advised the abrogation of the | between the United States and any other Reciprocity treaty, negotiated in 1854. He country our country shall have no right to was unwilling to aid in mercesing the wealth prevent the battleships of our for from going and population of Canada so long as Canada | and coming at pleasure through the canal, eargined a British dependency. He antic -Alaska to prevent Great Frita'n from extending her coast line upon the Pacific. He carns estly desired the political union of the United | may be at war, from ocean to ocean; and are States and British America, becomes such a to bind our hands against closing the canal to union would forever remove the necessity for Great Brita n has been preparing for such a

conflict since the close of the War of 1812,

Lucia, Permu ta, Jamalea, Halifax and Esquimault? Why is she constructing new and imprognable fort fleations at the entrance of Hat. ifax Bay? Why is she urging Canada to construct the Georgian Day and Ottawa Canal? Why is she demanding the port of Skagway, but to that of Alaska, also? Why has she so its servants and starf of employees.

In these days there was always one theatre where any one could go and invite friends to accompany without making careful inquiries beforehand as to the character of the play and as to whither it was included in 1898 the British Major-General committee of the Senate of Canada examined in 1898 the British Major-General committee. but to that of Alaska, also? Why has she so

admit of the passage of large gunboats without armament into Georgian Bay, the armament to be transported from Montreal by railway to Parry Sound, where a deep harbor is now being constructed. He expressed the opinion that it was not safe to rely upon the passage of gunboats through the St. Lawrence canals, as

they are near the American boundary line. As is well known. Canada has been enlarging the St. Lawrence canals between the port of Montreal and Lake Ontario. The canal nearest Montreal, the Beaubarnois, was on the south side of the River St. Lawrence. At a cost exceeding \$5,000,000 it has been superseded by a new canal, the Soulanges, upon the north side of the river. An American force must now cross the St. Lawrence to destroy any of the Canadian canals which connect Lake Ontario with tidewater.

Mr. Chamberlain has succeeded in involving Canada in the war to exterminate the two South African republies. It is notice to us that the same policy will be followed in the event of a war between this Republic and Great Britain. no matter what may be the issues which cause the conflict. SEATTLE. NEW YORK, Feb. 10,

PUBLIC OPINION AND THE CANAL

TAEATY. Emphatic Expressions by Leading Journals

-The Whole American Case Sacrificed. From the Chicago Times Herald. The Nicaragua Canal will be ours to build. It will also be ours to fortify. It will be an adjunct of our military power, the equivalent of a

vast increase in our navy. No enemy of the United States shall enter this waterway in time of war. It is not for the convenience of such that we are to bring our Atlantic and Pacific coasts nearer together by thousands of miles. It is for our own convenience and our own very great and special

The life of the enterprise is in this distinction. Hence the convention between Mr. Hay and Lord Pauncefote with regard to the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty is born dying if not dead. For by that arrangement there is no relative gain for this country. The interests all nations are advanced in like degree. carried out, must result in the Boers without entangling treaty violations to distress. What does the privilege of doing the work and collecting tolls amount to under the circumstances? The financial benefits are problematical, the political benefits nil. If we are to have a neutral canal it is immaterial whether it is built by us, by Great Britain, by any other power or by any combination of powers.

The fact is that the United States has fallen back twenty years in these negotiations. While the British papers speak magnanimously of British concessions, those concessions are imaginary. Two American Presidents and two American Secretaries of State pronounced long ago against the validity of British claims to a joint control. Their contention was that the canal should be managed for the protection of our national interests, that in this matter our primacy on the American continent must be recognized, that Great Britain had forfeited her rights under the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty by non-fulfilment of her own agreements. Why, then, should we recede from the advanced position which was taken not only by the ardent Blaine, but by Hayes, Garfield and Freinghuysen as well. Neither, we believe, will the Senate, before whom that convention must come for ratification.

An Indefensible Treaty. From the Chicago Tribune.

Leading Republican and Democratic Senators unite in opposing the ratification of the Hay-Pauncefote Nicaraguan Canal treaty, the official text of which was made public day before yesterday. The reasons for their opposition are so cogent and will appeal so strongly to public sentiment and public intelligence that it is impossible to believe the treaty will receive the sanction of the Senate. The prai-eworthy desire of the Administration to get rid of whatever obstacles there may be in the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty to the construction of a Nicaraguan canal seems to have made it oblivious of the fact that its method of getting rid of those obstacles is open to fatal objections.

The treaty contemplates the construction of the canal by the United States. It is to be allowed to expend without hindrance all the money it chooses and is to enjoy in return "the exclusive right of providing for the reguommerce, since it will be open to all at all lation and management of the canal." It can fix and collect the talls, and if the revenues de I see it argued by those who ought to know, | not cover the expenses of operation it can make that with such armament as this country pos- appropriations to meet the deficit. But, while permitted to build the canal and manage it. from injury or ruin by c-rtain enemies in time | the United States will not be permitted to proof war. It seems to me that if that is true we | teet it. It will not be allowed to erect fortificawould better not build the canal at all. The tions along the canal. The clause of the Claycanal could not be injured until our fleets were | ton-Bulwer Treaty which forbids that being crushed and if our fleets were crushed, it done is not abrogated. It is given full force by this proposed recognition of the binding obligation of a treaty which so many American

statesmen have contended has lapsed. Should the United States be involved in war with some naval power the canal the former has built and is to maintain is to be as free to the warships of its adversary as its own. That foreign power can, if it chooses, use the canal as a short cut to reach and ravage the Pacific coast and Pacific islands of the United States By the Hay-Pauncefote treaty the United States and Great Britain unite in guaranteeing a neutrality which may cost the former dear entitled to be pondered. I say agair, the and they contract to bring their agreement to the notice of other powers and invite them to

The American people will have none of these things. They have too much respect for the Monroe Doctrine to permit their Government to invite foreign Governments to unite with it in guarantees concerning an exclusively American waterway. They prefer that their Government should retain the whole matter exclueively in its own hands, just as if the canal were within its own territory. They believe its construction will benefit American trade, but they look on it mainly in the light of a work of national defence, which will be of inestimable value in times of war

The Hay-Pauncefete treaty, being in deroga-tion of the Monroe Doctrine and dangerous to the national welfare in times of war, should not be ratified.

How the Trenty Binds Our Hands.

From the Baston ! willy Advers It is claimed by and for Great Britain that nd the American systems. Mr. Chamberlain | the Hay-Panneefore treaty is a big "concesas declared that the parallel of this conflict | slon' on her part, inasmuch as it grants to the exists in South Africa and therefore halade. United States the high privilege of building crimined to destroy the two little republics and paving for the canal, and maintaining which threaten to disturb the supremacy of police protection for the same, and keeping it in repair; while the canal is to be open to all countries on countterms; and in case of war

By the terms of the Hay-Paune-fote treaty we are asked to expose our whole Pacific coast to the quick and easy transfer o vessels of any European nation with which we

The Canal and the Treaty. From the Built more American,

Opposition to the Has-Launcefore trenty seems to be growing in geometric ratio. The retly of Mr. Erodick, the Eritish Parlimentary contest over the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty was Secretary of the Foreign Office, to questions asked in the House of Commons, will necessars ate, rather than diminish, this growth. He stated yesterday that all the canal advantages the key not only to the wealth of the Klondike, of the former convention Clayton-Bulwer treaty) have been fully mainta need. If this is true, what does the United States gain by the Treaty? The only intelligent purpose in negotiating it must have been on the part of the ined in 1898 the British Major-General com- United States to gain some advantages which secret seeing.

But also we are fallen upon other days and there is no lack of evidence to the fact that M. Daly is no longer evith us. We still have the privage, however, of paying \$2, not only at the thrait will be east his name, but at all others days in France in the most money.

Indied States to gain some advantages which the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty dented, or to remove some restrictions which timposed. If the construction of the Georgian Bay is possible to the Trust, which is now usual the state of the construction of the Georgian Bay and Ottawa Canal. His declaration was emploited to the sake of art and education but to attract the most money. mediately after the ratification of the Clayton- youth and blood-relationship for dip

liuron. Michigan and Superior. His opinion Bulwer compact.

What conditions made that remarkable hardest of bard sense is best.

14 feet over the lock sills. Such a canal would American statesmen must have been hypnotized. It is directly opposed to the doctrine which for seventy-five years has controlled and guided this country in the relations of foreign states with the American Continent. This was quickly recognized after the treaty had been ratifled. Nothing but pride prevented its abrogation at the time, and subsequent violations of the treaty by England were joyfully welcomed as evidences of an unwillingness to be bound by the instrument. The greatest of secent American statesmen adopted this view officially, and so notified England. He held that the treaty was dead by England's own violations of it. A very large number of the public men in America agreed with him, while all considered it absolutely inconsistent with national policy and wished it was dead.

Few things in American diplomacy have been so obnoxious as the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty. This Hay-Pauncefote compact revives and perpetuates it.

Shall We Ratify a Blunder?

From the Washington Post.

To ratify the Hay-Pauncefote treaty is to abandon, finally and forever, the Monroe doctrine. It is to acknowledge England's right to say upon what terms the United States shall deal with another American power, and to invoke at every future national emergency the interference of Europe. These statesmen and editors who hall the proposed treaty as an abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer convention of 1850 are speaking without knowledge or reflection. This compact revives the Clayton-Bulwer convention. It re-establishes upon an enduring basis that colossal and humiliating blunder. It is the recessional of our su-

premacy in the Western Hemisphere. If this is to be an international canal, a joint property of the great powers, why need the United States assume all the expense of construction and maintenance? Is there anything in the Constitution to warrant Congress in appropriating the people's money for such a purpose? Will such a canal contribute to the safety, the welfare, the honor of the United States? Will it not, on the contrary, jeopardize and compromise all three? For our part, we shall regard the ratification of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty as a more perilous blunder than that of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty of fifty years ago. It not only ties our hands in the same manner as its predecessor did, but it contemplated also the array of all Europe against us should we, at any time in the future, awake to the danger of our predicament and seek to extricate ourselves. Verily, it begins to appear that possibly we were premature in pooh-poohing Mr. Joseph Chamberlain's hint at "a secret understanding."

The Real Question. From the Rochester Part-Express.

Nearly twenty years ago James G. Blaine, when Secretary of State, said in a letter to James Russell Lowell, Ambassador to Great Britain, that an interoceanic canal would be "substantially a part of our coast line." And he asserted emphatically that in time of war passage of armed vessels of a hostile on through the canal would be no more admissible than would the passage of armed forces of a hostile nation over the railway lines joining the Atlantic and Pacific shores of the United States." Outlining the changes which he thought were necessary in the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty in order "to meet the views of this Government," he said:

First-Every part of the treaty which forbids the United States fortifying the canal and holding the political control of it in conjunction with the country in which it is located, to be cancelled.

The Hay-Pauncefote treaty provides that the canal shall never be blockaded, and that no fortifications shall be erected commanding the canal or the waters adjacent.

Great Britain does not offer to construct the canal or supply any part of the money. The proposition is that the United States shall furnish the money and do the work, and then let a nation with which we may be at war use the canal on the same terms as ourselves. We say that the idea is simply preposterous. If the United States is to construct the canal the United States must control it and be at liberty o close it to an enemy in time of war.

MILITARY OPINION AGAINST THE CANAL TREATY.

The Purpose of the Nicaragua Canal De-

feated by the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty. From the Army and Navy Journa! The text of the Nicaragua Canal treaty with England, which has just been made public, mposes upon the United States the obligation providing for the completion of the canal. ther directly at its own cost, or by gift or loan of money to individuals or corporations. or through subscription to or purchase of stock or shares. The exclusive right of providing for the regulation and management of the canal is conceded to the United States, subect to a very strict agreement as to its neutralization, on the plan provided for the navigation of the Suez Canal. The navigation of the canal is to be enirely unrestricted in peace as well as in war. It is never to be blockeded. no act of hostility is to be committed within it. and vessels of belligerents are required to procoed through it with the least possible delay, not using it to revictual or take in stores, "exept so far as may be strictly necessary." whatver that elastic phrase may hereafter be de-

"No belligerent shall embark or disembark troops, munitions of war, or warlike materials in the canal, except in case of accidental hinderance of the transit, and in such case the transit shall be resumed with all possible despatch." When a belligerent wishes to block the canal "accidental hindrance" will muitiply. Vessels of war of belligerents must not remain longer than twenty-four hours in the canal or in waters within three marine miles of either end, "except in case of distress," and twenty-four hours must clapse between the departure of hostile vessels. The canal and all the appliances connected with it in time of war is in time of peace shall enjoy a complete immunity from attack by belligerents and from acts calculated to impair their usefulness as part of the canal. No fortification shall be erected commanding the canal or the waters adjacent. The United States, however, shall be at liberty to maintain such military police long the canal as may be necessary to protect it against lawlessness and disorder. Who is to determine the question of distress?

termined to mean.

Under the provisions of this treaty it would eem that the canal might as well be built by England, France or any other country, as by the United States. The chief argument for providing for it out of the public funds has en that it would make a very important addition to our means of defence by bringing our widely separated coast lines on the Atlantic and Pacific into direct communication by ater, and that the basin of Lake Nicaragua would furnish a depot where our sh ps of war could lie for a time in fre h wa er. These prospective advantages the treaty prop ses to surren ler, a d it is difficult to see what we are obtaining in return. Perhaps we shall get more light on the subject when the treaty is discussed in the Senate. As it stands we do not see what particular reason the State Department has for felicitating itself on the negotiation of this treaty. It is always easy to nego inte with the foreigner when you concede everything to him. The point in dispute in the that we should have exclusive control over a waterway on this side of the Atlantic, and one primarily intended, from a national point of view, to bind the two shores of our domain together. This point we have conceded. As it now stands, it is England with her greatly superior naval force that will have control of the canal in the event of war, in which treaties shrivel up like parehment in the flames.

To THE POPPOR OF THE SUN-NET: The kindly conservative spirit of "American," in his remarks anent the appointment of Mr. Hay's young son a Consul specting the construction of the Georgian Eay it does neither of the settings. The very evils and Ottawa Canal. His declaration was employed by future that the Imperial authorities desired against which popular sentiment revoited important that the Imperial authorities desired against which popular sentiment revoited important that the Imperial authorities desired against which popular sentiment revoited important that the Imperial authorities desired against which popular sentiments of the Clayton. ciency at a post, and during times wherein the